

## REMARKS

The claims have been rewritten to place them in better form, and to avoid the rejections of record. In an effort to expedite prosecution, and facilitate continuity of examination, Applicants provide the following general correlation between the originally filed claims and the new claims presented with this amendment, recognizing that many claims have been amended.

<u>Present Claims</u>	<u>Corresponding Claims</u>
49	1
50	New
51	New
52	New
53	New
54	New
55	New
56	2
57	3
58	4
59	5
60	6
61	7
62	8
63	9
64	10
65	11
66	12
67	13
68	14
69	15
70	16
71	17
72	18
73	19
74	20
75	21
76	22

<u>Present Claims</u>	<u>Corresponding Claims</u>
77	23
78	24
79	25
80	26
81	27
82	28
83	29
84	30
85	31
86	35
87	36
88	37
89	38
90	39
91	40
92	41
93	42
94	43
95	44
96	45
97	46
98	47
99	48
100	New
101	New
102	New
103	New
104	New
105	New

Claim 1 stands rejected under §102 on the basis of Maruyama et al. '330.

Claim 1 has been amended in new claim 49 to overcome this rejection, and Applicants respectfully traverse because Maruyama et al. did not disclose (or suggest) an antenna structure having, among other things, a sub-magnetic path in which a coil is not wound about a magnetic core. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 29-31 and 35-37 stand rejected under §103 on the basis of Teodoridis et al. '252. Claim 29 has been amended and rewritten as new claim 83, and Applicants traverse this rejection because the cited reference does not disclose or suggest the external size of the time piece recited in new claim 83, in combination with the other features of claim 83.

In the present invention, as defined by new claim 83, the external configuration of the timepiece has a relatively small external size such as a thickness thereof being not more than 10mm and a diameter thereof being not more than 30 mm. At least either one of a side section or a bottom cover section of the time piece is made of a metal material. The antenna structure so defined is provided inside such a timepiece, and can still correctly receive the standard radio wave.

However, the cited reference (Teodoridis et al. '252) as well as another cited reference (Maruyama et al. '330) fails to show or suggest the technical features that make it possible for an antenna structure which is arranged inside a case having a relatively small external size and which is located in the vicinity of a metal object, to receive such standard radio wave, and further fails to show or suggest about the conditions for implementing such radio wave reception.

Accordingly, applicants feel that the invention as defined by new claim 83 (based on original claim 29) would not be obvious to a person skilled in the art from these

cited references. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that this Application is now in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner should contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 

Patrick G. Burns  
Registration No. 29,367

**Customer No. 24978**

August 3, 2006

300 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 2500  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: (312) 360-0080  
Facsimile: (312) 360-9315